

32. (New) A method of providing multi-transaction services according to claim 31, wherein the metadata allows loosely-coupled objects to dynamically discover each other's services and behaviors at run time.

REMARKS

I. INTRODUCTION

In response to the Office Action dated April 14, 1999, claims 1-8 have been amended, and new claims 9-32 have been added. Claims 1-32 are in the application. Re-examination and re-consideration of the application, as amended, is requested.

II. DRAWING OBJECTIONS

In paragraphs (1)-(2) of the Office Action, Figure 1 was objected to because it was not designated as "Prior Art".

Applicants submit herewith a Proposed Drawing Change. Applicants will submit formal drawings at a later date.

III. SPECIFICATION OBJECTIONS

In paragraphs (3)-(4) of the Office Action, the Abstract was objected to because of the use of the term "means".

Applicants respectfully traverse this objection. The use of the term "means" is not intended to reflect the terminology in the claims, but is instead intended to reflect the terminology of the specification. Thus, to describe the disclosure fully, this terminology is proper.

IV. NON-ART REJECTIONS

In paragraphs (5)-(6) of the Office Action, claim 6 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite.

Applicants have amended claim 1 to overcome this rejection.

V. PRIOR ART REJECTIONS

A. The Office Action

In paragraphs (7)-(8) of the Office Action, claims 1-3 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 as being anticipated by Burt et al. In paragraphs (9)-(10) of the Office Action, claims 4-5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious in view of the combination of Burt et al. and Randle. In paragraph (11) of the Office Action, claim 6 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious in view of Burt et al as applied to claims 1-3 and further in view of PR Newswire Association, Inc. article. In paragraph (12) of the Office Action, claim 7 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious in view of Burt et al and PR Newswire Association, Inc. article as applied to claim 6 and further in view of the Entersoft White Paper. In paragraph (13) of the Office Action, claim 8 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious in view of Burt et al as applied to claims 1-3 and further in view of Randle, Huegel, and Marcous.

The Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections. None of the cited references, taken individually or in combination, teach or suggest these various elements of Applicants' independent claim.

Applicants' independent claims 1 and 17 are generally directed to a multi-transaction services system and method. The system and method include a plurality of service request and supply channels, wherein each channel includes channel-specific hardware and software and at least one operation means includes operation-specific hardware and software. The system and method also

A

include an integrated channel manager connected between the channels and the operation means. The integrated channel manager has (i) a first interface layer for interfacing the channel-specific components of each channel, (ii) a second interface layer for interfacing the operation means, and (iii) a third interface layer between the first and second interface layers and including at least one application service connectable to any channel in a channel-independent manner for performing one or more channel-independent functions using data supplied by the operations means, wherein the operations means is unaware of the function being performed by application service. Each application service is comprised of Presentation, Function, and Data Management elements, wherein the Presentation element is application logic that controls presentation of information to a user by the channels, the Function element is application logic that controls business logic for the application service, and the Data Management element is a collection of data and associated logic that manages data access and integrity.

In contrast, the Burt reference does not perform application services in a third interface layer between the first and second interface layers, wherein the application services are connectable to any channel in a channel-independent manner, wherein the application services perform one or more channel-independent functions using data supplied by the operations means, wherein the operations means is unaware of the function being performed by application services, and wherein each application service is comprised of Presentation, Function, and Data Management elements. Instead, the operations gateway of Burt merely interfaces the networks and the support systems, but none of the agents of the operations gateway perform any of the functions for which they take responsibility. It is the agent systems of Burt, i.e., the server systems connected to the operations gateway, that perform the desired functions.

Moreover, none of the other references overcome this deficiency in Burt. Randle is cited for disclosing a system where customers can obtain access to financial and non-financial information

products and services via customer operable transceivers at remote locations, the PR Newswire Association Inc article is cited for disclosing the OCCA structure as including 5 layers, Huegel is cited as disclosing a self-service terminal for selecting and dispensing tickets, Marcous is cited for disclosing the storage of electronic funds transfer transaction data in relational databases as a function of an electronic funds transfer system, and Entersoft White Paper is cited as disclosing NCR TOP END, which possesses, among other attributes, transaction monitoring capabilities, the enabling of distributed applications to communicate with each other, and the ability to provide critical services needed to manage the execution of applications. However, nothing in these references teach or suggest the structure of Applicants' invention. Thus, even if combined, the references do not teach the Applicants' invention.

Thus, the Applicants submit that independent claims 1 and 17 are allowable over the cited references. Further, dependent claims 2-16 and 18-32 are submitted to be allowable over the cited references in the same manner, because they are dependent on independent claims 1 and 17, respectively, and because they contain all the limitations of the independent claims. In addition, dependent claims 2-16 and 18-32 recite additional novel elements not shown by the cited references.

VI. DOUBLE-PATENTING REJECTION

On pages 11-13, the Office Action provisionally rejected claims 1-8 under the judicially-created doctrine of double-patenting over claims 1-8 of co-pending Application Serial No. 08/886,485.

Applicant notes the provisional nature of the rejection and will submit a Terminal Disclaimer upon receipt of an indication of allowable claims in the present application.

VII. CONCLUSION

In view of the above, it is submitted that this application is now in good order for allowance and such allowance is respectfully solicited. Should the Examiner believe minor matters still remain that can be resolved in a telephone interview, the Examiner is urged to call Applicants' undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

Morag M. Eaton et al.

By their attorneys,

GATES & COOPER

Howard Hughes Center
6701 Center Drive West, Suite 1050
Los Angeles, California 90045
(310) 641-8797

Date: July 14, 1999

By: 

Name: George H. Gates

Reg. No.: 33,500

GHG/